

Minutes
Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting
February 4, 2013

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:15 pm on the 3rd floor of the Levis Center with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

02/04/13-01 The minutes from December 3, 2012 were approved as written.

Senate Executive Committee Report

Matthew Wheeler (ACES), Faculty Senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), requested the granting of floor privileges for Paul Ellinger, Head and Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics (ACE) to speak to GP.13.06. Also Michael Bragg, Vicki Coverstone, and Elizabeth Stovall from the College of Engineering, and Vice Provost for Budgets and Resource Planning Michael Andrechak to speak to EP.13.07, EP.13.08, EP.13.09, EP.13.11, and EP.13.12.

02/04/13-02 Floor privileges were granted as requested without objection.

Faculty senator H. F. Williamson (LAS) and student senators Eric Federico (LAS) and Brock Gebhardt (LAS) served as tellers for the meeting.

Chair Wheeler announced that there are a number of important items on the agenda including a number of Educational Policy proposals, the filling of some committee vacancies, two institute or center proposals, a Coursera update and an important Committee of the Whole Discussion on Collective Bargaining. Wheeler requested that everyone stay for all of these important items.

Three SEC meetings were held since the last Senate meeting. On December 10 SEC discussed unwanted emails and office visits and current benefits issues. The discussion about unwanted e-mails and office visits have led to today's committee of the whole discussion. Again, Wheeler requested that everyone stay for that discussion.

On January 14th, the primary agenda item was the setting of the agenda for today's Senate meeting. And on January 28, SEC held the annual meeting with University President Robert Easter. The President discussed the current status of pension reform in the legislature, which is a moving target at this point, the budget where there is likely to be a 4% decrease, the tuition increase of 1.7%, which is the lowest in 18 years and the UI Labs initiative that was announced at the BOT meeting on January 24th.

02/04/13-03 Wheeler moved to adopt the time limits for presentations set in the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Wise welcomed everyone back to campus after winter break. The next stages of Visioning Future Excellence have been started. There were six themes that emerged last semester. Three meetings have been held to look more deeply into suggestions and advice in terms of the actions that should be put behind each of these. Meeting with groups of about 40 people have been held to look into the topics of Social Equity and Cultural Understanding, Environment and Energy, and Information and Technology.

These meetings consisted of 40 people meeting for two hours who are made up of faculty members recommended by the deans, some students and staff. There was a lot of brainstorming in terms of what from the deeper word clouds should be implemented and then developed

actions to put behind them. Then that same group reconvened with all of their ideas and they were asked to prioritize those ideas. This will help to guide us as we go forward. Wise will be talking with the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Provost, and the Associate Chancellor and Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, as well as the Deans as this is used as a framework for investment and also allows Wise to approach donors and see where their passions are and whether they map over what are the most important issues on campus. The second stage should be completed by the end of February and Wise will report back to the Senate as the project moves forward into March and April.

Questions/Discussion

Student senator Max Ellithorpe (GRAD) noted that he is a member of the Civic Leadership program that is being indirectly closed by the Department of Political Science. This group has struggled to retrieve information and updates from LAS and the Political Science department about the status of the Civic Leadership Program. Ellithorpe asked Chancellor Wise if she could assist in determining the status of the program since LAS and the Department of Political Science have not responded to the Civic Leadership Program members about the status of this program.

Wise replied that a possible reason for the lack of response is that a careful evaluation of the program is being conducted. There is an effort to try to figure out how the program can continue in a way that is sustainable and reaches a larger number of students. Wise requested that Ellithorpe give LAS and the head of the Department of Political Science as well as the donors for the Cline Center time to consider the best way to move forward.

Faculty Senator Al Kagan (LIBR) requested that SEC agendas be posted to the website or to receive an email when the agendas are posted. Chair Wheeler stated that SEC agendas are posted on the Senate bulletin board at the Senate Office at least 48 hours in advance of the SEC meetings. Wheeler agreed to have the SEC agendas posted to the Senate website going forward.

Consent Agenda

Educational Policy Chair Gay Miller requested the removal of proposal EP.13.25 from the consent agenda due to the incorrect title listed on the agenda. The title was listed as "Proposals from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Agricultural and Applied Economics". The correct title is "Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to Terminate the Illinois PSM concentration in the MS in Plant Biology", and will appear on the March 4, 2013 Senate agenda.

The following proposals were approved unanimously.

- 02/04/13-04 EP.13.07* Proposal to Establish a Master of Engineering Degree in the College of Engineering
- 02/04/13-05 EP.13.08* Proposal to Establish a New Major in Materials Engineering in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, College of Engineering for the degree of Master of Engineering
- 02/04/13-06 EP.13.09* Proposal to Establish a New Combined Bachelor of Science in Materials Science and Engineering-Master of Engineering with a Major in Materials Engineering in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, College of Engineering
- 02/04/13-07 EP.13.11* Proposal to Establish a Major in Engineering in the College of Engineering for the degree of Master of Engineering
- 02/04/13-08 EP.13.12* Proposal to Establish a Graduate Concentration in Energy Systems within the Master of Engineering Degree in the College of Engineering
- 02/04/13-09 EP.13.16* Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Engineering to terminate the Master of Science and the Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science in Civil Engineering, in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

- 02/04/13-10 EP.13.19* Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to establish a new graduate minor in Queer Studies, in the Department of Gender and Women's Studies
- 02/04/13-11 EP.13.21* Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to establish a new undergraduate minor in Food and Agribusiness Management, in the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics (ACE)
- 02/04/13-12 EP.13.27* Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to eliminate the concentration in Hebrew Language and Literature in the Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics
- 02/04/13-13 EP.13.28* Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to rename the Bachelor of Arts in Russian Language and Literature to Slavic Studies
- 02/04/13-14 EP.13.29* Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to establish a New Major Leading to a Master's of Science in Plant Biotechnology in Conjunction with a Professional Science Master's Concentration within the Department of Plant Biology

Proposals (enclosed)

- 02/04/13-15 CC.13.08* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate
- On behalf of the Committee on Committees, committee Chair Prasanta Kalita, moved approval of the nominees on proposal CC.13.08. Kalita then moved to amend this proposal by adding student Max Ellithorpe (GRAD) to replace Leah Dinh on the Educational Policy Committee. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 02/04/13-16 By voice vote, the motion to amend and approve nominees on CC.13.08 passed.
- 02/04/13-17 GP.13.03* Proposal to Establish the Confucius Institute
- General University Policy (GUP) Chair Nicholas Burbules presented the proposal. This proposal is to temporarily establish a Confucius Institute and if approved it would be reviewed in five years. Confucius Institutes are funded by Hanban which is part of the Chinese Ministry of Education. The primary initiative of this institutes is to establish collaborative research on language and language testing, but it also play a role in community outreach working with local schools in trying to improve language instruction; in this case, instruction in Chinese in public schools. This proposal has letters of support from the Department of Educational Psychology, The Center for East Asian and Pacific Studies, and the Unit 4 local school district. The institute would be housed in International Programs and Studies (IPS).
- 02/04/13-18 On behalf of the GUP Committee, Chair Nicholas Burbules moved adoption of GP.13.03. Discussion included a suggestion from faculty senator Mary Mallory (LIBR) to include the impact the proposal might have on the University Library similar to the requirements of establishing an academic unit. Burbules noted that it should not be a problem to add this suggestion to the template that has been drafted.
- Faculty senator Tony Long (LAS) expressed his concern that the partnering institution is of unequal academic standing, and also in the governance structure. Burbules replied that GUP had in-depth conversations about the governance structure and the proposal was amended accordingly. This is part of the reason the institute is being established as temporary.
- 02/04/13-19 By voice vote, the motion to approve GP.13.03 passed.
- 02/04/13-20 GP.13.06* Proposal to Establish the TIAA-CREF Center for Farmland Research
- GUP Chair Nicholas Burbules presented proposal. This proposal would be funded by a \$5 million endowment from TIAA-CREF and would be eligible for additional external funding as a focus on farmland research issues. It builds on strengths in the College of Agricultural, Consumer and

Environmental Sciences (ACES). The primary activity would be carrying out and disseminating research on US farmlands using the Illinois website, Farmdoc daily.

02/04/13-21 On behalf of the GUP Committee, Chair Nicholas Burbules moved approval of GP.13.06.

02/04/13-22 By voice vote, the motion to approve GP.13.06 passed.

Current Benefits Issues

This item was removed.

Reports

02/04/13-23 HE.13.03* FAC/ IBHE Report – November 16, 2012
 02/04/13-24 HE.13.04* FAC/ IBHE Report – December 7, 2012
 02/04/13-25 HE.13.05* FAC/ IBHE Report – January 18, 2012
 02/04/13-26 UC.13.04* USC Report – November 28, 2012
 02/04/13-27 UC.13.05* USC Report – January 17, 2012
 02/04/13-28 SC.13.10* BOT Observer Report – November 8, 2012

Coursera Update

A report on MOOCs (massive open online courses) was given by Deanna Raineri. The initial proposal was to offer ten MOOCs at Illinois. Two of the MOOCs were offered last fall, Introduction to Sustainability and Hetero Parallel Programming. Both courses were well received and had healthy enrollment. There are two current MOOCs, Microeconomics and Introduction to Organic Chemistry – Part 1. There are six more upcoming MOOCs, but the start dates have not been announced. Total enrollment in Illinois MOOCs is just over 230,000 in less than six months.

At the previous Coursera update, a MOOC review committee was mentioned. This faculty committee is charged with developing criteria to evaluate courses for delivery through a MOOC platform, assessing capacity of campus to support online education, and reviewing existing policies to determine suitability for MOOC offerings. This committee has made significant progress and an email should be sent out soon soliciting proposals for the next cohort of MOOCs.

The plan is to fully fund up to ten MOOCs. The faculty members have been very involved in this whole process of developing criteria and will be involved in the review process. The process of determining the next Illinois MOOCs is a three step process and will involve faculty governance. The first step is a short pre-proposal. In this step, courses will be evaluated based on such things as alignment to the land grant mission, ability to enhance curricula offerings to our own students, and the ability of the course to attract students to online and residential programs.

The next step is MOOC compatibility. The MOOC format is very video intensive. There are usually 8-10 minute video segments with interspersed assessments. During this step, the ability of the course content to fit this MOOC format is assessed, or how well the instructional approaches will fit MOOC technology. The third step is the full proposal. This will include a detailed course curriculum, budget, etc.

The committee has also been reviewing our existing policy and how it fits the MOOC environment. For the most part, the existing policy does fit the MOOC environment. There have been a lot of questions about intellectual property content ownership. The faculty members own the course content. The same rules apply to our residential campus courses and to our MOOCs. The same applies for policies on accessibility and copyright. The Fair Use Doctrine does apply to the MOOC environment, but is more restrictive. There are various committees, faculty members, and University Legal Counsel looking into this issue. Right now this will be done on a case-by-case basis.

Resources that are available will be posted to the MOOC website, mooc.illinois.edu, which will be launched soon. Information will include the RFP, a guide to MOOCs, articles about MOOCs, and MOOC templates, and FAQ.

Kim Graber (AHS) asked how textbooks and articles are handled since MOOCs are free. If you use a textbook, Coursera does not want textbooks to be required. You can recommend a textbook, link to a website that sells the textbook, but not require it.

The PowerPoint presentation can be found on the Senate website at:

<http://www.senate.illinois.edu/130204coursera.pdf>

Committee of the Whole

Chancellor Wise requested that Chair Wheeler to lead the discussion on collective bargaining and faculty unionization. Wheeler stated that two presentations, each 10 minutes, would be given. Randy McCarthy gave the presentation supporting the issue, and Nicholas Burbules gave the presentation opposing the issue. The second portion was a 20 minute discussion on the issue. Comments were taken back-and-forth from supporting and opposing viewpoints.

02/04/13-29 A motion was made to move into the Committee of the Whole discussion. The motion was seconded, and approved by unanimous consent.

Randy McCarthy gave the following remarks in support of collective bargaining and faculty unionization:

Senate ideas, R. McCarthy, 2/2

Theme: Why I want Collective Bargaining

Who am I?

Hi, my name is Randy McCarthy. I've been at UIUC for 18 years and I'm a professor in Mathematics. Like many of you, I came here because this is a great school in a nice community. I am a strong believer in the adage: "if you don't like something for 5 years it is your fault." To this end I eagerly sought to become part of shared governance on this campus. I had to petition to serve on the Department's Grad Affairs Committee before I was tenured and again to serve on the Executive Committee before I was promoted to full professor. The atmosphere of shared governance on this campus was so positive at that time that it played a major role in my decision to stay when courted by other schools. I again set a new standard when I served as the Director of Undergraduate Studies the year I was being promoted to full professor and then 5 years later serving as the Department's Graduate Director.

Transition.

Given this history of positive participation in shared governance, you may wonder how I became a supporter of collective bargaining. Certainly, during my first 10 years here I would not have conceived of it and truly it is only in the last couple years that I realized collective bargaining would help address problems that concerned me and upon further research I was surprised to discover that collective bargaining often improves shared governance.

Problems I see.

When I came to UIUC, our campus was rated one of the "best bargains" in the country, my classes, even the freshman level calculus classes, were 30 students, my research was stimulated by my 73 fellow faculty and a generous startup grant from the campus. Today, we are the most expensive public school, my calculus classes have over 200 students, and the now 60 faculty are often too busy to interact with one another. After all, the over 20 percent reduction in faculty met with no change in graduate students to advise and more than a 20 percent increase in overall instruction. In recent years my students have had to take exams on their books because the desks are broken, attend classes with coats because the rooms are so cold or sweating profusely because they are so

hot. As a graduate director, I discovered that there are plenty of Deans in the Graduate College but it is critically understated for dealing with actual day-to-day problems of students. My research moneys are taxed and the ICR moneys are spent like administrative slush funds. What I do get to keep no longer is dictated by the granting agency but by an entirely new level of bureaucracy that was created as an inappropriate response to campus failing its audit.

Transition to the source.

The search for Hogan was a horrible example of top down business practices and the end result a predictable disaster. When I served on the LAS 5-year strategic planning committee put in by President White, we were told that the trustees and White wanted us to move to a more business model, but at the time I did not realize what this really meant. Only later did I begin to understand how the centralization of moneys takes away from shared governance. Not unlike the loss of state powers as Federal government centralized taxation. That year I watched Dean Mangelsdorf fight to keep what discretionary moneys she could in her terribly underfunded college but to little success. My own first serious signs of trouble happened the next year. I had been working to create a Bio-Math course, with 5 departments from 3 colleges to serve nearly 1000 students annually. We worked for over a year meeting almost weekly and it was shot down immediately because we needed space for 60 students throughout the day. At the time, there were whole floors of buildings standing empty in Engineering and rooms that were rarely used for CITES training, but so it goes. Is this shared governance? Over the following years I observed with horror the transformation of departmental administrators from dreamers and doers to pessimists and damage control experts. Not long after, my pension, health care and other benefits began to be regularly attacked, but the powerful centralized administration seemed unable or unwilling to take the fight seriously.

Administrators are not to blame.

I have rarely met an administrator I didn't like and who wasn't working to do their best and often with a schedule I would not wish upon my enemies. What I saw as administrative bloat collectively compared to what I observed individually confused me for several years. Then I learned of a Social theory for the Collapse of Complex Societies which provided insight to what I was witnessing. In a nut shell, the theory suggests that overtime, administration loses touch with the original purpose it was intended to serve as it becomes overly preoccupied in managing its own ever increasing levels of bureaucracy. Eventually, the top becomes too heavy and the whole things topples.

We need to get the balance back. It seemed clear to me that somehow, in our panic to address growing financial concerns and the natural process of centralization afforded by technology (i.e. Banner) our process of shared governance was lessened. As an administrator, I can see how this happens. You need expediency and often you either can't or don't have time to fully inform everyone of what you know so they will see the correct solution as clearly as you do, so you act, with the best of intentions, but the shared process suffers.

Why we must act.

Once I understood this, I wondered what, if anything, could be done about it? For you see, I feel we MUST do something about it if we believe in the US model of a public research University. I do not intend to retire from an institution which is less than the one I came to serve in 94 and if we, the faculty, do not defend the educational prerogatives of our students and the quality of excellence in our research, then who will?

How Collectively we can.

We need a means to raise our collective voices to administration so that we will not only be politely listened to for advice but once again respectfully invited as a partner in the debate of our campus' future (remember our request to have a faculty attend the trustee meetings?).

When I looked to see what some other campuses had done, I learned that faculty Unionization was often motivated to address faculty concerns beyond salary, including issues of class size, workloads, shared governance as well as pensions, health care and benefits. In short, collective bargaining helps address the distribution of moneys within the campus as faculty needs are listened to. For example, with Union support, the faculty at UIC were able to get much needed and overdue safety equipment installed in 107 labs. Several years ago, the faculty at Rutgers University voted to not take their base pay raises for two years in order to preserve faculty positions.

I learned that the process of collective bargaining informs every one of the needs and limitations of everyone else. The process of contract negotiations are a time when administration and faculty must actually listen to one another. Faculty senates often obtain contractual powers, not just advisory, and at research institutions, differential pay is maintained. Union contracts are written by the faculty and administration working together.

For pensions, health care and other benefits, shared governance is not the proper tool to obtain solutions. It is unfair to ask administrators who need to beg for basic operating funds to also fight like tigers for our benefits and it is cowardly to ask other public employees to fight for us. Collectively, through a Union, we could make a difference on these issues as well.

End.

I believe that a democratic faculty union would give us an independent voice on issues that lie outside the scope of existing institutional structures while restoring a balance of understanding to our process of shared governance. That strong faculty voice is needed to protect and advance the principles of our university.

Randy McCarthy's presentation supporting collective bargaining can be found on the Senate website at: http://www.senate.illinois.edu/130204pro_mccarthy.pdf

Nicholas Burbules gave the following remarks in opposition to collective bargaining and faculty unionization:

SENATE REMARKS ON FACULTY UNIONIZATION
NICHOLAS C. BURBULES
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
FEBRUARY 4, 2013

Faculty unionization would mean the end of the University of Illinois as a top-tier institution. Here's why:

1. Many of our best faculty would leave because they don't want to be part of a unionized campus. Several have said so already. Union organizers aren't making clear to people that once 50% plus one of the faculty vote for a union, all faculty would need to be represented by the union and pay "fair share" dues to it whether they want to or not. We are constantly fighting to prevent top faculty from leaving, and this would be the tipping point for many of them.

It would also be a severe impediment for recruiting top talents to come here, for the same reasons.

2. The only AAU schools with unions – Florida, Oregon, Rutgers, a couple of the SUNY branches – are good schools but not peers. Conversely, none of our peer institutions, public or private, is unionized. Private universities, in fact, can't be unionized, and this would be one more advantage our prime competitors have in hiring away our best people.

I can see why capturing a campus like this would be a big win for the cause of faculty unionization – and I'm sure that's why the national AAUP and AFT are putting so many resources into the union

drive here. But it would do nothing to lift this campus's prestige – it would damage it. You hear a lot of rhetoric from union advocates, but you never hear them talk about excellence.

3. Look at our sister campus in Chicago, which is literally split over the union issue. The gap between the unionized East and non-unionized West campuses there has never been bigger. For us, this would involve a split between departments and colleges on the same campus, and toxic relations among the pro-union and anti-union faculty who remain here.

4. Union advocates suggest a future of plenty. But no less an authority than Cary Nelson, former President of AAUP and a strong union advocate, admits, "[R]esearch shows that, although unionized community college faculty earn more than their nonunionized counterparts, full-time unionized and nonunionized faculty at 4-year institutions earn about the same." ("What Unions Do," March 15, 2011).

5. The primary source of threats to our salary and benefits is outside the power of a faculty union to negotiate. At a time of diminishing state revenues, the problem is not "bosses" who refuse to pay workers more, but the budgetary constraints imposed on the university by the state of Illinois.

In fact, the people most affected by increased union demands would be tuition-paying students and their parents. I just ask you to imagine what newspapers around this state would write about increased faculty salary demands and the threats of a strike from a high-tuition school like Illinois. It would be a public relations disaster.

6. Union advocates assure us that the discretion of campus units to differentiate salaries and provide competitive counter-offers to faculty would not be diminished by a collective-bargaining system. But with a shrinking revenue pie, it seems counterintuitive to claim that you can substantially raise salaries for all faculty while also raising the ceiling for the most in-demand faculty.

7. We have a highly decentralized system at Illinois, which gives a great deal of flexibility to deans and department heads on salary. Faculty members deal directly with their local administrators over this issue, and that model has served us very well. But in a unionized context, those discussions could no longer take place. Collective bargaining would occur between a handful of union representatives and members of the University Administration, a step removed from the level of the campus. It is ironic that unionization would create a much more centralized salary system than the one we have now. It is also ironic that union advocates complain about the "corporatization" of the university, while proposing changes that would make the university function more like a unionized business, and less like a self-governing academic community.

8. There are many more questions. What would annual dues be, and why aren't people being told this before committing to the union? In light of the budget constraints we face, is there any reason to expect that net salary increases would offset the annual dues being paid, beyond what most faculty could expect to receive in the normal salary process? (The research cited below is not encouraging on this point.) Would unionization commit faculty to sympathy strikes or not crossing picket lines in solidarity with the GEO, custodial workers, or other unionized campus employees who might strike? What would a faculty strike look like, and what would its effects be on public support for the university? What would happen to faculty who want to continue to teach their courses? Would they be called out by their union colleagues as scabs? If faculty define themselves as employees, not as professionals, will that hasten state regulations like Positive Time Reporting that require every university employee to record their exact working hours? Do we want to make longstanding professional rights like tenure and sabbatical simply matters of collective bargaining, and how would that affect the state's and the public's willingness to continue to support them?

9. *Other unionized universities are already having buyer's remorse and looking to de-unionize. I have been told that many faculty up at UIC are already having second thoughts. But union rules make it extremely difficult to undo this decision; it is onerous even for individuals to withdraw their signed union cards.*

So this isn't something we can "try out" for a while, and then change our minds if it doesn't work out as we hoped. Instead, we'll be right back here having this argument all over again. But by then the damage will already be done.

Let me now briefly address the issue of shared governance.

Along with other elected Senate leaders, I have seen close up some of the biggest challenges to shared governance in recent years. Our Senate, its elected leaders and governance processes, have been very effective in exposing and pushing back against Global Campus, the Academy on Capitalism and Limited Government, the admissions scandal, and most recently the Hogan/Troyer mess.

In each case it was the efforts of the Senate that helped change policies and demanded accountability from administrators, even when it meant calling for them to step down. Our system of shared governance works, and it works very well.

In fact, our shared governance system at Illinois is viewed as a national model. James Duderstadt, former President at the University of Michigan, says it is the strongest system of shared governance in the country. At many universities the senates are ineffectual in representing faculty interests and are routinely ignored by campus administrators. I can see why under those circumstances faculty might think that only a union can represent their interests effectively. But that is not the situation we face here at Illinois.

Shared governance is not broken. Unionization would break it. Here's why:

1. Shared governance is based on the model of a collaborative partnership between faculty and administrators. That doesn't mean we don't have big arguments. But it is a relationship of collegiality, trust, and mutual respect that makes those disagreements effective.

The collective bargaining approach, whether you like it or not, is based on a fundamentally adversarial model. It draws sharp lines between "workers" and "management" and emphasizes the incompatibility of their interests, which need to be worked out in a process of aggressive negotiation from both sides under the potential threat of a strike. That's what unionization is, and that is antithetical to the spirit of "shared governance."

2. Those of you in the Senate have seen this shift of rhetoric from union advocates serving in this body. A tone of suspicion, hostility, and even disrespect has been on frequent display in their comments toward campus and university administrators. Look: when you treat people like adversaries they react like adversaries. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy. A collective bargaining campus will be characterized by frequent contract renegotiations, with accusations of stonewalling and bad faith shooting back and forth, and threatened or actual strikes. Do you want to be part of a campus like that?

3. When you are talking about coal miners or garment workers, it makes sense to talk about the struggle between workers and bosses, under the logic of capital accumulation. But this is a very poor analogy for how universities work.

Administrators aren't our bosses, and they have very limited abilities to direct our work. They aren't "other" to the faculty; they are faculty themselves, they share the academic values of faculty, and many continue their faculty work. The collective bargaining game is based on the

assumption that "management" will not address or appreciate faculty concerns unless they are forced to do so. That is not our situation here.

4. I also don't see how you can make faculty governance stronger by taking rights and responsibilities away from it. Our Senate and its committees do not only deal with issues of academic policy.

Due to time limitations, Burbules ended his presentation at this point.

Nicholas Burbules's full presentation opposing collective bargaining can be found on the Senate website at: http://www.senate.illinois.edu/130204con_burbules.pdf

The discussion portion of the committee of the whole discussion followed.

Megan McLaughlin (LAS) asked Nicholas Burbules to clarify if his remarks were personal or on behalf of the SEC. Burbules responded that his comments have his name only on them and no one else's.

James Barrett (LAS) noted that research was mentioned several times by Burbules, and some of the findings Burbules mentioned did not sound familiar to Barrett. At UIC there was a huge majority in favor of unionization and the results were produced twice. Some of the problems with might be happening with collective bargaining have not been addressed properly to the union or to the Senate. The problem might actually be with collective bargaining law in the state of Illinois. This issue has come before SEC and then the full Senate about complaints about visits to faculty offices. One of the concerns is that there could be intimidation. We have found examples of intimidation and tend to be on the other side, not from the pro union side.

Joyce Tolliver (LAS) stated that collective bargaining comes at a cost. Tolliver gave the example that at some institutions, annual union dues are approximately 1% of a faculty member's salary. According to the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act, a campus unit would be authorized to bargain about wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Currently at Illinois there is a process to file a grievance if a faculty member feels his/her merit raise was unfair. At Rutgers University, faculty cannot grieve their merit raise increase, only the procedure used to arrive at it. Research faculty members in particular do not have fixed working hours and this cannot and should not be regulated centrally. Terms and conditions of employment would be up to the union to decide how to interpret. At Florida University, working conditions include course assignments and class size.

Al Kagan (LIBR) responded to Burbules's mention of how we cannot influence state budget. Kagan does not believe this to be true. As a past member of the Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits committee, Kagan mentioned that the committee can only discuss local benefits such as parking. He felt that in order to influence what goes on in Springfield, you have to part of the state union coalition, and Illinois is not. If Illinois had a union, then it would be part of that coalition. In talking to faculty members, there are two main issues that continue to be mentioned; pensions and healthcare. Those benefits are not decided on the local level.

John Prussing (ENGR) voiced his concern about the worker/management union model. He did not feel that this model applies to this campus. With this model, a department chair would migrate back and forth from worker to management. The faculty members are independent entrepreneurs to bring innovation and funds to the university. The standard union model does not seem to support this.

Monica Bielski (LER) noted that the union is not an outside institution imposed upon a workforce. It consists of the people represented by the union. The faculty would be making democratic decisions. Electing collective bargaining was designed to build collaborative and harmonious

relations in the workplace. When it breaks down in higher education, it is usually when one or both sides are acting in an unhealthy way.

George Francis (LAS) gave his opinion that there is a problem with the corporatization of a university, centralization, and top-down management.

02/04/13-30

A motion was made to move out of the committee of the whole discussion. The motion was seconded and approved by voice.

New Business

No new business.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:16 pm.

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

*Filed with the Senate Clerk and incorporated by reference in these minutes.